

According to the IAEA, and by Iran's own bravado, Iran is now beginning to enrich uranium on a far larger scale than ever before.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to be tying our hands on Iran. We all seek a peaceful solution. No one wants another war. But if we don't take a tough stance on Iran and maintain the threat of military action, Iran will get the message that we don't care if it gets nuclear weapons. It will allow the most dangerous regime in the world to continue its quest for regional and world domination, and destroy the only democratic country and the United States' most reliable ally in the region, Israel. I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding, and also for your leadership on this issue.

I am very concerned with Iran's efforts to acquire nuclear weapons, like I am concerned about any country's efforts to acquire nuclear weapons. Preventing this, though, will not happen through military action.

Unfortunately, the President's saber rattling against Iran is only increasing and is eerily similar to the march to war with Iraq. We must act to prevent another war of preemption, this time against Iran.

That is why this amendment is so important. It would clarify that no previous authorization constitutes an authorization to use force against Iran.

Secondly, this amendment would make certain that no funds would be used to take military action against Iran in the absence of specific congressional authority or a direct attack as defined by the War Powers Act.

Beyond this, we must make certain that the United States is not funding covert action intended to cause regime change in Iran. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee did not rule in order an amendment that I would have that allowed for this sort of debate.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and also to recognize that this is a critical first step this body can take in preventing war with Iran.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, we all realize that it is the responsibility of every Congress to ensure that the current administration adheres to the Constitution and the rule of law.

Most of us understand how this administration used the policy office within the Pentagon to falsify intelligence and to provide the Congress with false information in an attempt to justify the illegal invasion of Iraq and the subsequent disastrous military occupation which has been going on there now for more than 4 years.

This amendment makes perfect sense. It simply ensures that kind of

behavior by this administration is not extended now into another country in the Middle East, Iran, based upon the same falsification of information and failure to adhere to its obligations under the Constitution.

This amendment must be passed. It makes perfect sense, and it ensures the security of our country and makes sure that our military personnel are not exposed to the kinds of danger that they have been exposed to as a result of the falsification of intelligence by this administration. Let's pass this amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just offer to my colleague who just spoke and my other colleagues that there are the strongest statements for invasion of Iraq that took place before President Bush came into office, and those were the now famous speeches that were made by three Senators by the name of KERRY, CLINTON, and GORE.

Mr. Chairman, the War Powers Act clearly calls for the ability of the Commander in Chief to introduce American military force where an emergency with respect to a nation has been declared. That emergency with respect to Iran has been declared by every American President since President Carter in 1979. This is not extra-constitutional. The law as it presently exists is consistent with the Constitution. This would infringe. In fact, this would roll back the War Powers Act. Every Member should vote against this amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The President is not reading in full the War Powers Act. It says the President's constitutional powers "are exercised only pursuant to (1) a declaration of war, (2) specific statutory authorization, or (3) a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces."

My amendment actually allows that exact language. If our troops are attacked, if we are attacked, if our territories are attacked, then the President could retaliate. So I am restating the war powers.

In this case we also heard about a declaration of war from the gentlewoman from Nevada. The Congress has the authority to take up a declaration of war tonight, tomorrow, anytime it deems fit against Iran. Nothing in this amendment would prevent a Congress from declaring war.

It is just saying if you want to have a preemptive war under the Constitution of the United States, a preventive war, then you need to come to Congress under article I, section 8.

If you believe in the Constitution of the United States and the powers of this branch, vote for this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 110-151.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Ms. WOOLSEY:

At the end of title I, insert the following:

SEC. 1. STUDY ON NEED FOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS THAT WERE ORIGINALLY DESIGNED TO FIGHT THE COLD WAR AND THE FORMER SOVIET UNION.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a study on the weapons systems being produced for the Department of Defense that were originally designed to fight the Cold War and the former Soviet Union.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, and to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate a report on the results of the study carried out under subsection (a). The report shall identify the weapons systems covered by the study and, for each such weapons system, shall—

(1) describe whether the weapons system meets current needs;

(2) specify, and compare, the cost of fitting the weapons system to meet current needs and the cost of developing and procuring a new weapons system to meet current needs;

(3) explain the reasons why the weapons system continues to be produced for the Department; and

(4) quantify and describe the savings achieved by decommissioning and dismantling weapon systems no longer needed as a result of the demise of the former Soviet Union the threats it posed to national security.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 403, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is our job in Congress to make tough decisions. So given the quagmire in Iraq which is costing \$273 million every day, and our troops still don't have the training and equipment they need, and given we have critical needs at home that aren't being fully funded, needs like children's health care, rebuilding the gulf coast, keeping our promise to veterans, repairing tornado-ravaged towns and collapsed bridges, and I could go on and on, and you know it.

Sadly, we are still spending at least \$60 billion every year to build and